

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figures 7 and 8 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. Figure 7 has been amended. Appended to this amendment is an annotated copy of the previous drawing sheet which has been marked to show changes presented in the replacement sheet of the drawing.

The specific change which has been made to Figure 7 is to change “V – Vmap” in step 205 to “Vmap – V.”

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraphs 0002, 0004, 0006, 0007, 0024, 0025, 0032, 0037, 0038, 0040, 0042, 0043, 0053, and 0055 have been amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-21 are now pending in this application.

#### **Statement of Substance of Interview**

Applicant once again expresses their gratitude for the interview conducted on April 11, 2007. In accordance with the request in the Interview Summary of April 11, 2007, that the applicant file a statement of substance of interview, please be advised that the Examiner's Interview Summary accurately summarizes the interview.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Office states that the language "vehicular speed variation rate limiter" is indefinite. The claims have been amended to overcome this rejection. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the term "limiter" is well known in the art and one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the meaning of this term. As a non-limiting example, IEEE STD 100-1992 provides definitions of a "limiter." See attached copy of IEEE STD 100-1992, Fifth Edition, page 716. In a further example, a limiter can be a transducer in which the output amplitude is substantially linear with regard to an input up to a

predetermined value, and have a substantially constant output amplitude above the predetermined value.

The Office states that the phrase “a response characteristic on a vehicular plane motion to be enabled to provide a predetermined response characteristic” is indefinite. The claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

The language “calculate a vehicular motion control mechanism command value” is rejected as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to overcome this rejection. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the language “control command value” would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art to be a value necessary for the recited system to perform the function recited in the claims.

The Office states that the language “the vehicular motion target value calculating section is configured to determine a map reference vehicle speed on the basis of an output of the vehicular velocity variation rate limiter” is indefinite because the terms “speed” and “velocity” are being used interchangeably. The claims and specification have been amended to provide consistency in the use of these terms.

Claim 2 is rejected because the language “to increase the vehicular speed variation rate limit value (dVlimit)” is indefinite. Claim 2 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant’s disclosure enables one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation. For example, Applicant’s disclosure discusses an embodiment of a vehicle speed variation amount limiter in paragraphs 0038-0042 of the specification and in Figure 7. Therefore, claims 1-11 are sufficiently enabled by Applicant’s disclosure. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date APR 30 2007

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5426  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,371